

**DEPARTMENT OF RESOURCES RECYCLING AND RECOVERY**

1001 I STREET, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814 • [WWW.CALRECYCLE.CA.GOV](http://WWW.CALRECYCLE.CA.GOV) • (916) 322-4027  
P.O. BOX 4025, SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95812

December 10, 2014

**To:** All Prospective Contractors

**RE:** "2015 Processing Fee and Handling Fee Cost Surveys"

**Addendum No. 2  
To the (RFP) Method DRR14044**

**The following questions were received during the Questions and Answers period.**

Document Requests:

- Q1. Are the prior proposals public documents? Can we get a copy of Crowe Horwath's and Newpoint Group's last two proposals before the RFP response deadline?
- A1. Please access this information using the following link:  
<ftp://ftp.calrecycle.ca.gov/RetainedFor30Days/> . User name is "ftpuser" and password "crftpuser".
- Q2. Can you provide examples of typical information requests (i.e., the notice provided to a processing fee recycler and a handling fee recycler prior to the site visit)?
- A2. Please access this information using the following link:  
<ftp://ftp.calrecycle.ca.gov/RetainedFor30Days/> . User name is "ftpuser" and password "crftpuser".
- Q3. Can you provide a copy of the Training Manual and the Excel Model used in the previous review?
- A3. Please access this information using the following link:  
<ftp://ftp.calrecycle.ca.gov/RetainedFor30Days/> . User name is "ftpuser" and password "crftpuser".
- Q4. Can you provide a list of all current recycling centers that will be part of the sampled population base? If available, could you provide this list with the recycling centers grouped by Handling Fee vs. Processing Fee recycling centers?



- A4. Please access this information using the following link:  
<ftp://ftp.calrecycle.ca.gov/RetainedFor30Days/> . User name is “ftpuser” and password “crftpuser”.
- Q5. Can you provide a list of all current processing centers that will be part of the sampled population base?
- A5. Please access this information using the following link:  
<ftp://ftp.calrecycle.ca.gov/RetainedFor30Days/> . User name is “ftpuser” and password “crftpuser”.
- Q6. Can you provide a list of all recycling centers that were sampled in each of the previous reviews? If available, could you provide this list with the recycling centers grouped by Handling Fee vs. Processing Fee recycling centers?
- A6. The list of previously surveyed sites cannot be published publicly but the contractor that is awarded the cost survey contract will have access to these site files.
- Q7. Can you provide a list of all recycling and processing centers which are currently “under investigation” and not subject to this review? Also, if available, could you provide a listing of recyclers and processors which were “under investigation” for the previous two reviews?
- A7. No, but CalRecycle will assist the contractor that is awarded the contract in determining which sites are currently under investigation and should be pulled from the cost survey.
- Q8. The prior survey report states that CalRecycle has participated in a site visit for a Handling Fee and Processing Fee facility. Would we be able to review a copy of the actual survey results of the site visits conducted with CalRecycle present?
- A8. No, the information obtained from the individual site surveyed cannot be publicly released, but CalRecycle can outline that processing site fee survey. In that survey, we took a tour of the facility and then spoke with the owner of the site. The owner provided their tax return information and the team asked for either clarification or a breakdown of what percentage of time was spent on the material types. Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 2960, 2965, 2970, 2990 and 2995 breaks down allowable cost for recycling centers, processing centers and handling fee sites. For further breakdown of allowable and non-allowable costs see the Cost Model Excel Spreadsheet and Volume III of the Training Manual.

Requests for Clarification:

- Q9. Can you describe the coordination process between CalRecycle, the contractor, and the recycling site prior to going on-site?
- a. Will CalRecycle have an onsite team person that will help coordinate the survey requests?

- b. Will CalRecycle contact, follow up and encourage state recyclers to participate in this year's survey?
- A9. CalRecycle provides volume data, address, contact person and phone number to the contractor. The contractor determines the methodology and sample plan to be used in the cost survey. The contractor sends out the letter stating what financial information is required and schedules site visits directly with the site. CalRecycle will assist the contractor in determining if a site should be dropped due to lack of responsiveness.
- Q10. Is any information provided by the recycling site in advance?
- A10. The recycling center does not normally provide data in advance, but CalRecycle provides volume data, address, contact person and phone number to the contractor. Additionally, CalRecycle has site file folders for previous cost surveys that can be used by the contractor that is awarded the contract.
- Q11. What information does CalRecycle maintain on all California State recyclers?
  - a. Does CalRecycle have access to financial data from prior years?
  - b. Can access be granted through CalRecycle's system?
- A11. CalRecycle does not have financial data from recyclers other than what was gathered during previous cost surveys. CalRecycle gathers data from participants which states the volume of each material type, address, contact person, etc. The contractor gathers financial documents from the recycling center and combines the two data points to determine the actual costs of recycling.
- Q12. Can you describe what a typical site visit to a Handling Fee Site involved as part of the prior work (1-2 hours on-site average) including the specific type and level of financial review that was conducted?
- A12. The handling fee survey is essentially the same as the processing fee survey in that the same data is pulled. This is necessary as the difference between the cost of a handling fee site versus the cost of a non-handling fee site is used to determine what the handling fee rate is. Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 2960, 2965, 2970, 2990 and 2995 breaks down allowable cost for recycling centers, processing centers and handling fee sites. For further breakdown of allowable and non-allowable costs see the Cost Model Excel Spreadsheet and Volume III of the Training Manual.
- Q13. Can you describe what a typical site visit to a Processing Fee Site involved as part of the prior work (2-4 hours on-site average) including the specific type and level of financial review that was conducted?
- A13. CalRecycle has been out on one of the surveys for a processing fee site. In that survey, we took a tour of the facility and then spoke with the owner of the site. The owner

provided their tax return information and the team asked for either clarification or a breakdown of what percentage of time was spent on the material types. Title 14 of California Code of Regulations, sections 2960, 2965, 2970, 2990 and 2995 breaks down allowable cost for recycling centers, processing centers and handling fee sites. For further breakdown of allowable and non-allowable costs see the Cost Model Excel Spreadsheet and Volume III of the Training Manual.

- Q14. What is primary focus of the training as it relates to the on-site audit and review of information?
- A14. Please see Volume III of the Training Manuals.
- Q15. What type of information is provided by the recycler during the site visit?
- A15. The contractor reviews financial documents (including tax returns, depreciation schedules, equipment inventory, etc.) to determine the allowable costs. See Volume III of the Training Manual for a breakdown of what was done in the 2013 cost survey.
- Q16. Can you confirm what are the primary financial documents provided by the sites? Are the documents primarily tax records or audit reports (reports prepared under Generally Accepted Accounting Principles). Were there other types of financial documentation provided and if so can you provide a list of all of the types of documents that were provided in support of the analysis?
- A16. See Volume Ia, Module 8 of the Training Manual for the detail of financial documents required to determine the actual costs of recycling. The financial documents provided by the recycling centers and volume (by material type), which are generated from CalRecycle, are used to determine the actual costs of recycling.
- Q17. What type of review of that information is conducted on-site?
- A17. The contractor reviews financial documents (including tax returns, depreciation schedules, equipment inventory, etc.) to determine the allowable costs. See Volume III of the Training Manual for a breakdown of what was done in the 2013 cost survey.
- Q18. Is there any review of that information conducted off-site after the site visit and if so what did that review typically involve?
- A18. See Volume III of the Training Manual for a breakdown of what was done in the 2013 cost survey.
- Q19. Are copies of the recyclers' financial information taken off site?
- A19. A lot of recycling centers do not like to have their financial documents taken offsite due to confidentiality reasons. Determining which site should be surveyed, setting up the site surveys and contacting the sites can be done ahead of time. Gathering the financial documents is usually done out in the field. Once field work is complete, final review and analysis is usually done.

- Q20. Is there any follow up / analysis / confirmation of the provided financial information?
- A20. During the 2013 cost survey, the contractor ensured accuracy by having multiple levels of review. These levels were, “site team review, independent manager review, CPA partner review, business analyst review and project director review”.
- Q21. As we understand, the financial information presented by recycling sites is largely taken at face value for purposes of generating the study’s results. However, during the proposer’s conference, CalRecycle staff indicated that in the past there may have been certain recyclers that would be considered “outliers” in the sense that their provided financial information appeared to be suspect of inconsistent with the norm and which needed to be reviewed and revised. Therefore:
- a. Can you clarify the level of detail of additional review that would be expected for a recycling site considered to be such an “outlier” in this sense?
  - b. Could you estimate the percentage of the total population of recyclers that were considered as “outliers” which required additional review/revision during the previous study?
  - c. Of those “outliers”, could you estimate what percentage ultimately required changes to their originally-provided financial information?
- A21. Usually an outlier is under investigation by CalRecycle and will have already been pulled from the potential sites to be surveyed. However, CalRecycle will assist the contractor in determining if the site is an outlier and should be dropped from the survey and an alternative site would be used.
- Q22. Can you provide an estimate of how many recycling sites were repeated as samples between the past two studies?
- A22. About 65 sites that were surveyed in the 2011 survey were also surveyed in 2013.
- Q23. Can you clarify what additional services are being requested for “Processing Centers” (not previously covered by the scope of the survey)? Or, clarify how the requested services for “Processing Centers” differ from the services requested for “Recycling Centers,” if at all?
- A23. CalRecycle anticipates that the processing center survey will be similar in nature to the recycling center surveys.
- Q24. Are there any aspects of the prior surveys that CalRecycle feels could or should be improved?
- A24. Not that CalRecycle is aware of but if a contractor has any new ideas, then they should be submitted in their proposal.
- Q25. Is it possible to get a copy of the Cost Survey Model spreadsheet?
- A25. Yes.

- Q26. Do you have a list of the DVBEs that have been used in the past?
- A26. For the last cost survey, Leon E Tuttle CPA and Dennis Nelson CPA APC were used as DVBE subcontractors.
- Q27. It seems to be a large contract (\$2,500,000 budgeted), how much was spent on the last contract?
- A27. The 2013 cost survey contract was for recycling centers only and \$1,723,455 was spent on it.
- Q28. RFP – Definition of PET#1 and HDPE#2 on page 12.
- A28. These are types of plastics. PET#1 are typically plastic water bottles and HDPE#2 are usually milk jugs.
- Q29. Were the final reports based off of any standards or was it a contractor's report? What type of report? Contractor's report or consultant's report?
- A29. Please see Clause 11 (Deliverables) of Exhibit D to the Agreement (available in Attachment J of RFP) for the requirements for formatting of the final report. CalRecycle has not made a distinction between "contractor's reports" and "consultant's reports" in this context – the awardee of this contract will be both a contractor and consultant to CalRecycle. Previous final reports are available on CalRecycle's public website for review.
- Q30. Why is CalRecycle using CPAs? Is this a new requirement?
- A30. Using CPAs is desired rather than required as the documents that get reviewed are financial documents. These documents require a certain level of skill/expertise to maintain accuracy of the cost survey.
- Q31. Training materials: Will they be available before the response to the RFP is due?
- A31. Yes.
- Q32. Can a list of all facilities be provided, both handling and processing (including locations)?
- A32. Please access this information using the following link:  
<ftp://ftp.calrecycle.ca.gov/RetainedFor30Days/> . User name is "ftpuser" and password "crftpuser". Please note that these sites are current as of this posting but are not final as CalRecycle has not received final data from these sites.
- Q33. The cost survey has not included processors for a number of years. Have processors been notified of their inclusion in the 2015 Cost Survey? Will CalRecycle help support the contractor in obtaining information from processors that are resistant?
- A33. The processors have not been contacted as of yet. CalRecycle will work closely with the contractor to contact the processors and to assist with any difficult sites.

- Q34. Since Attachment C, the SB/DVBE Participation Summary includes dollar amounts, should it be included with the Cost Proposal, rather than the technical proposal package?
- A34. No. Include the “Small Business/Disabled Veteran Business Enterprises (DVBE) Participation Summary” document as part of the overall proposal package. Do not put it inside the sealed envelope with the Cost Proposal Sheet.
- Q35. Item o) of the Description of Work refers to “referenced items in (a) and (b)...” it appears that this should be “(d) and (e)”, is that correct?
- A35. Yes, that is correct.
- Q36. You haven’t done processing fees in the past?
- A36. Processing fees are different from processing centers. The cost survey, which has been done for many years, is the cost of recycling for recycling centers and is used to determine processing fee and processing payments. CalRecycle is including processing centers into the cost survey for the first time.
- Q37. CalRecycle has done five cost surveys? Has it always been Newpoint/Crowe Horwath doing the cost surveys? Is there a reason why CalRecycle wouldn’t use them again? Is there an advantage to Crowe Horwath doing the cost survey in the past that is significant?
- A37. Crowe Horwath (previously, Newpoint) has done the last five cost surveys. CalRecycle is always open to any new or creative ways of conducting these cost survey.
- Q38. Is the cost survey bid done every year or every two years?
- A38. The cost survey is done every two years.
- Q39. Was the DVBE a requirement last time as well?
- A39. DVBE participation was encouraged for the last cost survey and bidders who met DVBE participation thresholds received a preference on their bid amounts.
- Q40. Does CalRecycle have a list of DVBEs?
- A40. Please visit the website for the Office of Small Business & Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise Services (OSDS) for help locating DVBEs. The website is available at <http://www.dgs.ca.gov/pd/Programs/OSDS.aspx>.
- Q41. People who have access to BidSync are the only ones able to access the RFP?
- A41. The RFP is also available on CalRecycle’s website at [www.calrecycle.ca.gov/contracts](http://www.calrecycle.ca.gov/contracts).
- Q42. Is there a list of DVBEs or just a list of people that have accessed the RFP?
- A42. Please see Attachment 1 for the list of interested parties, which may include DVBEs.
- Q43. Who has been surveyed in the past and when?
- A43. This list cannot be published publicly but the contractor that is awarded the cost survey contract will have access to these site files.

- Q44. Can you provide an estimate of how many recycling sites were repeated as samples between the past two studies?
- A44. Around 10.6 % of recycling centers were surveyed in both the 2011 and in the 2013 cost survey.
- Q45. There's a significant increase in the cost, does that have to do with the sample size? How many were sampled for 2011 versus 2013?
- A45. For the 2011 cost survey, there were 292 unique recycling center sites. In 2013, there were 320 unique recycling center sites. To ensure that the contract covers a possible increase in sites, there was an increase in the sample size in the Description of Work. Additionally, processors are being included for the first time in the cost survey.
- Q46. The sample size for 2013 was 320 and is being increased to 350 RCs and 80 PRs?
- A46. Yes. See #45 answer.
- Q47. Has CalRecycle been out on any of the surveys and seen the process? Can you explain the level of review that happens during those 2 – 4 hours?
- A47. CalRecycle has been out on one of the surveys for a processing fee site. In that survey, we took a tour of the facility and then spoke with the owner of the site. The owner provided their tax return information and the team asked for either clarification or a breakdown of what percentage of time was spent on the material types. Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations, sections 2960, 2965, 2970, 2990 and 2995 breaks down allowable cost for recycling centers, processing centers and handling fee sites. For further breakdown of allowable and non-allowable costs see the Cost Model Excel Spreadsheet and Volume III of the Training Manual.
- Q48. The cost survey numbers are generated directly from the facility or from CalRecycle?
- A48. This is a combination of both. CalRecycle gathers data from participants which states the volume of each material type, address, contact person, etc. The contractor gathers financial documents from the recycling center and combines the two data points to determine the actual costs of recycling.
- Q49. Can a lot of the survey be done offsite? Or even get the financial documents prior to going to the site? Are copies of the recyclers' financial information taken off site?
- A49. A lot of recycling centers do not like to have their financial documents taken offsite due to confidentiality reasons. Determining which site should be surveyed, setting up the site surveys and contacting the sites can be done ahead of time. Gathering the financial documents is usually done out in the field. Once field work is complete, final review and analysis is usually done.
- Q50. Is there a requirement/standard for what type of financial documents are involved?
- A50. See #47 answer.



- Q51. Does CalRecycle help the contractor by providing a letterhead and notify them if there any problem sites?
- A51. Yes.
- Q52. What is the process for a site to be surveyed? What kind of coordination CalRecycle does and what does the contractor have to do in terms of contacting the site and requesting information? Can you describe the coordination process between CalRecycle, the contractor, and the recycling site prior to going on-site?
- a. Will CalRecycle have an onsite team person that will help coordinate the survey requests?
  - b. Will CalRecycle contact, follow up and encourage state recyclers to participate in this year's survey?
- A52. CalRecycle provides volume data, address, contact person and phone number to the contractor. The contractor determines the methodology and sample plan to be used in the cost survey. The contractor sends out the letter stating what financial information is required and schedules site visits directly with the site. CalRecycle will assist the contractor in determining if a site should be dropped due to lack of responsiveness.
- Q53. What is the end goal for the cost survey?
- A53. To determine the actual cost of recycling for each material type for recycling centers and processing centers. Additionally, the handling fee is determined using the cost of recycling for non-handling fee sites versus handling fee sites.
- Q54. What kind of processor will be sampled in the survey? How many processing centers are in the program?
- A54. The contractor will determine how many processors to sample and which ones they will sample based on the methodology they use. Processing centers are similar to recycling centers in that there are large facilities and small facilities. There are 219 processing centers currently certified operational. Please note that these sites are current as of this posting but are not final as CalRecycle has not received final data from these sites.
- Q55. The handling fee and processing fee from recycling centers have been done before and the survey of processing centers is new?
- A55. Some processing centers have recycling centers so the recycling center side could have been surveyed in the past, but the processing center is a new addition to the survey.
- Q56. CalRecycle does not have any data from the processing centers at this point?
- A56. CalRecycle does not have any financial documents from processing centers but does have the volume data that is necessary to determine the cost of processing the material.
- Q57. CalRecycle is looking for data concerning CRV material only?

- A57. Yes.
- Q58. Does CalRecycle have a sense for the level of review that processing centers will need in comparison to the recycling centers? Would CalRecycle like to see more detailed analysis? Is it the same level of analysis for the processor as it is for the recycling center?
- A58. CalRecycle anticipates that the processing center survey will be similar in nature to the recycling center surveys.
- Q59. Do you have any concerns for the recycling centers and processing centers and how they might be gaming the system?
- A59. The job of the contractor is to determine the cost of recycling, not investigate fraud.
- Q60. How many centers are currently under investigation?
- A60. There are around 300 recycling centers and around 15 processing centers currently under investigation. This number can and will change when the final data is compiled.
- Q61. Can we get a list of centers that are under investigation?
- A61. No, but CalRecycle will assist the contractor that is awarded the contract in determining which sites are currently under investigation and should be pulled from the cost survey.
- Q62. If a contractor was to duplicate the training and the methodology that was done in the past as a baseline, would that capture the data and level of accuracy that CalRecycle requires? Would that be sufficient?
- A62. Potential bidders may refer to previous years' training manuals and methodologies as a baseline, however, this year's proposal also includes surveying costs from certified processors which has never been done previously.
- Q63. In the RFP, what is the optimal sample size that CalRecycle would require? Additional testing for a higher level of accuracy?
- A63. The sample size is determined by the contractor, the RFP states a general number for bid purposes only. CalRecycle sampling plans have historically had a 90 percent confidence level and a 10 percent error rate.
- Q64. On page 12 section (l) of the RFP, what do you mean by that?
- A64. Ensuring that the data is accurately captured and entered by having multiple levels of review throughout the process. During the 2013 cost survey, the contractor ensured accuracy by having multiple levels of review. These levels were, "site team review, independent manager review, CPA partner review, business analyst review and project director review".
- Q65. Copies of the previous proposals? Does this have to go through the freedom of public information act?

- A65. Please access this information using the following link:  
<ftp://ftp.calrecycle.ca.gov/RetainedFor30Days/> . User name is “ftpuser” and password “crftpuser”.
- Q66. Does the request for the training manuals fall under the freedom of information act or can it be released?
- A66. Please access this information using the following link:  
<ftp://ftp.calrecycle.ca.gov/RetainedFor30Days/> . User name is “ftpuser” and password “crftpuser”.
- Q67. What is primary focus of the training as it relates to the on-site audit and review of information?
- A67. Please see Training Manuals for detail.
- Q68. Can CalRecycle release how many of the RCs that were surveyed in the 2011 were surveyed again in the 2013 survey?
- A68. About 65 sites that were surveyed in the 2011 survey were also surveyed in 2013.
- Q69. Would CalRecycle become more involved if a site was unresponsive?
- A69. Yes, CalRecycle will become involved if necessary. CalRecycle has the authority to revoke or suspend a site’s certification if the owner is unresponsive per Public Resources Code section 14591.1 and Title 14, California Code of Regulations, section 2125. However, as this takes time, the site would more than likely have to be dropped and an alternate site chosen. This should be seen as a last resort.
- Q70. Could CalRecycle share the letter that gets sent out to the recycling centers? Does it explain what type of information is required in advance?
- A70. Please access this information using the following link:  
<ftp://ftp.calrecycle.ca.gov/RetainedFor30Days/> . User name is “ftpuser” and password “crftpuser”.
- Q71. What type of information is requested from recycling centers?
- A71. See #47 answer.
- Q72. Can CalRecycle describe a typical site visit? What type of information is reviewed and what is done with that information?
- A72. See #47 answer.
- Q73. CalRecycle joined the training in which a site visit was surveyed by the contractor. Would that site sample be provided? What was done there? What was asked during that visit? Was this a handling fee site or processing fee site?
- A73. That individual site’s information cannot be publicly released. See #47 answer.

Q74. What is different about the handling fee survey in comparison to the processing fee?

A74. The handling fee survey is essentially the same as the processing fee survey in that the same data is pulled. This is necessary as the difference between the cost of a handling fee site versus the cost of a non-handling fee site is used to determine what the handling fee rate is.

Q75. Can a list be provided for the handling fee sites?

A75. See attached. Please note that these sites are current as of this posting but are not final as CalRecycle has not received final data from these sites.

Q76. What is the level of detail on the financial documentation provided? Is it accepted at face value? Is there anything done to ascertain where it came from or if it's accurate? Is this financial information used to develop the costs?

A76. See Volume Ia, Module 8 of the Training Manual for the detail of financial documents required to determine the actual costs of recycling. The financial documents provided by the recycling centers and volume (by material type), generated from CalRecycle, are used to determine the actual costs of recycling.

Q77. Can you confirm what are the primary financial documents provided by the sites? Are the documents primarily tax records or audit reports (reports prepared under Generally Accepted Accounting Principles). Were there other types of financial documentation provided and if so can you provide a list of all of the types of documents that were provided in support of the analysis?

A77. See #76 answer.

Q78. What type of review of that information is conducted on-site?

A78. The contractor reviews financial documents (including tax returns, depreciation schedules, equipment inventory, etc.) to determine the allowable costs.

Q79. Is there a separate review to determine accuracy?

A79. During the 2013 cost survey, the contractor ensured accuracy by having multiple levels of review. These levels were, "site team review, independent manager review, CPA partner review, business analyst review and project director review".

Q80. If the financial documentation is reviewed on site, is there any follow up reviewing? Any other information that might be provided or follow up after the site visit or is it all done on site?

A80. See Volume III of the Training Manual for a breakdown of what was done in the 2013 cost survey.

- Q81. As we understand, the financial information presented by recycling sites is largely taken at face value for purposes of generating the study's results. However, during the proposer's conference, CalRecycle staff indicated that in the past there may have been certain recyclers that would be considered "outliers" in the sense that their provided financial information appeared to be suspect of inconsistent with the norm and which needed to be reviewed and revised. Therefore:
- a. Can you clarify the level of detail of additional review that would be expected for a recycling site considered to be such an "outlier" in this sense?
  - b. Could you estimate the percentage of the total population of recyclers that were considered as "outliers" which required additional review/revision during the previous study?
  - c. Of those "outliers", could you estimate what percentage ultimately required changes to their originally-provided financial information?
- A81. Usually an outlier is under investigation by CalRecycle and will have already been pulled from the potential sites to be surveyed. However, CalRecycle will assist the contractor in determining if the site is an outlier and should be dropped from the survey and an alternative site would be used.
- Q82. Are recyclers required to submit the financial documentation to CalRecycle? How would the contractor know if a site is out of the norm?
- A82. Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations section 2125 gives CalRecycle the authority to obtain cost survey data. Additionally, CalRecycle has hard copy files of the previous recycling center cost surveys.
- Q83. Is CalRecycle concerned between the difference between a tax return which follows tax guidelines and GAAP (generally accepted accounting principles)?
- A83. CalRecycle is concerned with getting accurate financial documentation to assist in determining the actual costs of recycling.
- Q84. Can you clarify what additional services are being requested for "Processing Centers" (not previously covered by the scope of the survey)? Or, clarify how the requested services for "Processing Centers" differ from the services requested for "Recycling Centers," if at all?
- A84. CalRecycle anticipates that the processing center survey will be similar in nature to the recycling center surveys.

Q85. The end result of the processor survey is the actual cost per ton for each material type?

A85. Yes.

All other terms, conditions, and requirements of this (RFP) will remain the same.

If you have any questions relating to this (RFP) process, please contact me by e-mail at [contracts@calrecycle.ca.gov](mailto:contracts@calrecycle.ca.gov).

Sincerely,  
*{Original Signed By}*

Wendy Roberson  
Contract Analyst  
Administrative Services Branch

Attachment

CalRecycle has not confirmed the certification status of firms who have identified themselves as CA Certified Small Business (SB) or Disabled Veterans Business Enterprise (DVBE).

Contact (First & Last Name)	Email	Company	Mailing Address	SB	DVBE
Wendy Pratt	<a href="mailto:Wendy.pratt@crowehorwath.com">Wendy.pratt@crowehorwath.com</a>	Crowe Horwath, LLP	400 Capitol Mall, Ste. 1400, Sacramento, CA 95814		
Ed Boisson	<a href="mailto:ed@boissonconsulting.com">ed@boissonconsulting.com</a>	Boisson Consulting	48 Cushing Avenue, San Rafael, CA 94903	X	
Steven Andersen	<a href="mailto:steven@maciasconsulting.com">steven@maciasconsulting.com</a>	Macias Consulting Group	3000 S Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95816	X	
Linda Martin	<a href="mailto:lmartin@maciasconsulting.com">lmartin@maciasconsulting.com</a>	Macias Consulting Group	3000 S Street, Suite 300, Sacramento, CA 95816	X	
David Button	<a href="mailto:davidb@amlp.com">davidb@amlp.com</a>	Armanino LLP	44 Montgomery St., Ste. 900, San Francisco, CA 94104		
Laura DiMaria	<a href="mailto:Work43@prime-vendor.com">Work43@prime-vendor.com</a>	Prime Vendor	4622 Cedar Avenue, Wilmington, NC 28403		
David Davis	<a href="mailto:dave@msw-consultants.com">dave@msw-consultants.com</a>	MSW Consultants	27393 Ynez Road, Ste. 259, Temecula, CA 92591		
Alan Zdanowski	<a href="mailto:azdanowski@headwaycorp.com">azdanowski@headwaycorp.com</a>	Headway Workforce Solutions	421 Fayetteville Street, Raleigh, NC 27601		
Chizoma Onyems	<a href="mailto:ochizoma@gmail.com">ochizoma@gmail.com</a>	Primetech	823 Sunnyslope Way, Auburn, CA 95603	X	
Malia Grigsby	<a href="mailto:mgrigsby@r3cgi.com">mgrigsby@r3cgi.com</a>	R3 Consulting Group, Inc.	1512 Eureka Road, Ste. 220, Roseville, CA 95661	X	